

# CCB Meeting

## Decision Summary

Thurs., February 19, 2004  
9:00 a.m.  
Rockledge 1  
Fifth Floor Conference Room

### Requests Covered

	Submitted By	Area Affected	Type of Request	User Impact	Document Title
01	Lana Diggs	CGAP Exchange	Adding error message for existing validation requirement	Critical	CCB_2_17_2004_item1
02	Tim Twomey	Memory/Thread Leak	Change the reboot parameter on one of the commons server	Low	CCB_2_17_2004_item2
03	Pamela Williamson	SBS	Baseline Cost Code Changes	Low	CCB_2_18_2004_item3

### Request & Decision Summary

	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Area Affected</b>	<b>Type of Request</b>	<b>User Impact</b>	<b>Document Title</b>
	Lana Diggs	CGAP Exchange	Adding error message for existing validation requirement	Critical	CCB_2_17_2004_item1
01	<b>Request:</b> The current CGAP Supplementary Specification states two requirements as one. We need to split it up into two parts in order to verify that the code can meet both paths. The code will need to be modified to separate the two as distinct possible paths and add an additional error message.				
	<b>Current Spec Section 1.2.1.4</b>		<b>Error Message</b>		
	Must be one and only one component with a role of PI or PD. There cannot be both a PI and a PD.		Only one component with role of PI or PD allowed. There cannot be both a PI or PD		
	<b>Proposed Spec Section 1.2.1.4</b>		<b>Error Message</b>		
	Must be at least one component with a role of PI or PD.		There are no PI or PD roles included. Please provide at least one role of PI or PD.		
	Must be only one component with a role of PI or PD. There cannot be both a PI and a PD		Only one component with role of PI or PD allowed. There cannot be both a PI and a PD.		
	<b>Decision:</b> This item was previously Approved via the expedited process and has already been implemented. It is contained in this report for informational purposes.				

	Submitted By	Area Affected	Type of Request	User Impact	Document Title
	Tim Twomey	Memory/Thread Leak	Change the reboot parameter on one of the commons server	Low	CCB_2_17_2004_item2
02	<p><b>Request:</b> The memory and thread leak problem was originally observed over one year ago. Since then there are a lot of changes in the environment as well as code. Additionally the metric that were used have also changed. Originally the thread leak was reported using the “top” utility of OS. But if now we are using OC4J dms tool for monitoring the threads. As the same time we are still unable to reproduce the problem in the test environment.</p> <p>So as a result we would like to see the dms tool results in the production environment. To do this, all we need to do is turn off automatic reboot on one of the three commons server.</p> <p><b>Goal:</b> Monitor runtime environment to verify the scenario that causes the production container to crash, gather information from logs and the system to get a snapshot of system as and when the problem occurs.</p> <p><b>Risks:</b> If and when the production container crashes, users who currently have a session on that container will have to re-login to continue their work. The commons site will always be available. The other users and new users will not be impacted by this.</p> <p><b>Steps:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disable cron job that re-cycles the production container on Corvus (9.0.2.3) running the Commons Application, every night at 11pm.</li> <li>2. Ops currently has a script that mails runtime statistics on an hourly basis, this script will mail runtime information every hour to Manjeet, Raghu and John.</li> <li>3. Monitor and track production logs (log4j.log and application.log) when memory utilization hits the threshold (80% of capacity). Monitoring the logs will be possible only during normal business hours.</li> <li>4. If and when the production container crashes, backup log files and re-cycle the production instance immediately. (This might not happen till sometime next week, because of the scheduled maintenance outage this weekend).</li> <li>5. This will be done twice to accurately verify that the problem is re-producible.</li> </ol> <p><b>Decision:</b> This item was previously approved via the expedited process and has already been implemented. It is contained in this report for informational purposes.</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. (Kalpesh Patel) Provide status update at next CCB meeting (2/26/04).</li> </ol>				

	Submitted By	Area Affected	Type of Request	User Impact	Document Title
	Pamela Williamson	SBS	Baseline Cost Code Changes	Low	CCB_2_18_2004_item3
03	<p><b>Request:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Due to feedback as a result of the new release of SBS, it is necessary to define a business rule with respect to how non-specific module meetings will be handled by vendor personnel when estimating their time in SBS. These meetings include but may not be limited to CCB, Operations, and Project Team.</li> <li>(2) Received a request to collect OPDIV charges using SBS codes.</li> <li>(3) The subtasks currently listed in the SBS system can be simplified based on an analysis of the structure.</li> <li>(4) Other cost code changes were required by several of the Branch Chiefs. All changes requested as of 2/18/04, 3:00 p.m., are intended for inclusion in this change request.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Resolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) It is proposed that vendors charge to their normal tasks since participating in meetings is done as part of the normal support for the work they are performing.</li> <li>(2) OPDIV charges for government analysts will go to cost code 9b.67; OPDIV charges for contractor analysts will go to cost code 9a.07.07. It is concluded that there is no need for other OPDIV cost codes at this time.</li> <li>(3) The format proposed for the subtasks that are part of "10" was reviewed and is provided in the attached proposed cost code changes. This new format simplifies entry but does not change the intent of the cost code roll up.</li> <li>(4) The cost code changes in the change request include: addition 5.5.5, 5.8, 5.81, 5.9, 5.10, 6.3, 6.4, 9a.2.71, 9b.71, and 10.2.71; revision to 9c.3 for iEdison task award to NGIT; revision of the subtasks associated with "10."</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p>				